

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed September 10, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

The Applicants thank the Examiner for taking the time to speak with the Applicants' Representatives on October 10, 2007. The substance of the interview is set forth in the Remarks and constitutes a record of the interview. The finality of the Office Action mailed September 10, 2007 was discussed. The Examiner agreed that the finality of the Office Action was premature. Accordingly, the Examiner agreed to withdraw the finality of the September 10, 2007 Office Action.

Claims 1-4 are hereby amended. No new matter has been added. Claim 6 was previously canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-5 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

**The Office Action rejects claims 1-5 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No 7,192,102 (hereinafter "the '102 patent") in view of either *Katz* or *Visin*.** The Applicants traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a clothes dryer, which includes, among other features, a "hook having a first end disposed on a surface of the control panel and a second end... the second end of the hook inserts into a hole disposed in the groove in the top cover; and a fire wall made of metal disposed below the second end of the hook inserted into the groove in the top cover." Independent claim 4 has been amended to recite a laundry dryer, which includes, among other features, "a control panel including a hook disposed at a surface of

the control panel ...and a fire wall disposed below the top cover and the entire structure of the hook.” Neither the ‘102 patent, *Katz* nor *Visin* claim at least these features. Because none of the references claim each and every feature, they cannot render claims 1-5 obvious and the claimed invention is patentable. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the double patenting rejection of claims 1-5 over the ‘102 patent in view of *Katz* or *Visin* be withdrawn.

**The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Katz*.** The Applicants traverse this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, “the reference must teach every element of the claim.” The Applicants submit that *Katz* does not teach every element of claims 1-3 and therefore cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite a clothes dryer, which includes, among other features, a “hook having a first end disposed on a surface of the control panel and a second end... the second end of the hook inserts into a hole disposed in the groove in the top cover; and a fire wall made of metal disposed below the second end of the hook inserted into the groove in the top cover.” *Katz* fails to disclose at least this feature.

The Examiner alleges that *Katz* teaches each and every feature of the claimed invention, wherein reference number 22 allegedly anticipates the claim feature of “fire wall.” *See pages 2-3 of the Office Action.* The Applicants respectfully disagree. *Katz* discloses a rear cover member 22 that includes slots 56. After the hooks 55 pass through slots 56, the control housing 48 “is moved rearward so that the hooks overlap the adjacent portions of the rear cover member panel 28.” *See Figures 2 and 3 and column 2, lines 14-33.* In other words, the purpose of *Katz*’s rear cover member 22 is to attach the control housing 48 to the outside of cabinet 11.

In contrast, a feature of the claimed fire wall is to direct “a fluid toward an outside of the body when fluid leaks through the hole,” as recited. Katz’s rear cover member 22 simply does not possess this feature. The feature recited in claim 1 can prevent water from entering electrical accessories in the clothes dryer. *See page 4, paragraph [0010].* For example, the curved surface of the top cover and the groove prevents any water on the top cover from entering the dryer cabinet. *See, for example, page 7, paragraph [0024].* Moreover, if any water enters the dryer cabinet through a hole disposed in the groove, this water reaches a fire wall disposed below the top cover prior to reaching any electrical accessories. The fire wall directs any water that enters the cabinet to an outside of the cabinet. *See, for example, page 8, paragraph [0025].* Therefore, *Katz* fails to disclose a “fire wall,” as claimed.

Nevertheless, even if, assuming *arguendo*, one of ordinary skill construed rear cover member 22 as a “fire wall,” as suggested, *Katz* discloses that a second end of the hooks 55 is below the rear cover 22. Therefore, *Katz* cannot possibly be considered to disclose “a fire wall...disposed below the second end of the hook inserted into the groove in the top cover,” as recited in claim 1.

For at least the aforementioned reason, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Katz*. Likewise, claims 2 and 3, which depend from claim 1 are also patentable for at least the same reason. Accordingly, Applicants request the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1-3 over *Katz* be withdrawn.

**The Office Action rejects claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Visin*.** The Applicants traverses this rejection.

The Applicants submit that *Visin* does not disclose every element recited in claims 4 and 5 and therefore cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, independent claim 4 has been amended to recite a laundry dryer, which includes, among other features, “a control panel including a hook disposed at a surface of the control panel . . . and a fire wall disposed below the top cover and the entire structure of the hook.” *Visin* fails to disclose at least this feature.

The Examiner alleges that *Katz* teaches each and every feature of the claimed invention, wherein reference number 22 allegedly anticipates the claim feature of “fire wall.” *See pages 3-4 of the Office Action.* The Applicants respectfully disagree. *Visin* discloses that reference number 22 is a console housing, wherein “at least one surface of the console housing (22) can engage with a corresponding surface area on the appliance cabinet (14).” *See Figures 2-7 and column 5, lines 45-47.* In other words, the console housing always rests on top of the corresponding surface of the appliance cabinet. Moreover, *Visin* fails to disclose that the control housing contemplates the same purpose as the instant invention. Therefore, even if, assuming *arguendo*, one of ordinary skill construed console housing 22, as suggested, *Visin* cannot possibly disclose “a fire wall disposed below the top cover and the entire structure of the hook,” as recited in claim 4.

For at least the aforementioned reason, the Applicants submit that claim 4 is patentably distinguishable over *Visin*. Likewise, claim 5, which depends from claim 4, is also patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants request the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 4 and 5 over *Visin* be withdrawn.

The application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: December 10, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael L. Argent (Reg. No. 46,522)  
for Mark R. Kresloff  
Registration No.: 42,766  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant